

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

inaugurated by Alexander and continued by the Roman Empire. It thus broke down completely the reticence and the conservatism of ages in Egypt, a process which the authors place over 250 years later at the close of the eighteenth dynasty! That the great invasion of Syria by the Hittites at this time caused the total collapse of Egyptian power in Asia seems to have been unperceived by the authors, and is not even referred to by them (pp. 161-163). Again, in this very age of Egypt's decline abroad the authors place an extension of the Pharaoh's conquests in the Euphrates valley among the kings of Assyria and Babylonia, with whom, as the Amarna letters show, the Pharaoh was at this time enjoying relations of profoundest peace and friendship! The identification of Hittites and Hyksos (and elsewhere also of Etruscans) is unfortunate, and is totally without basis; nor was there any Hittite invasion of Syria before the latter part of the eighteenth dynasty. These examples will illustrate the defects of the work. The presentation in the little book of the new results from the archaic age deserves consideration as a serious contribution. To these results the excavations of Mr. Garstang have made a number of valuable contributions, while the excellent field-work of Mr. Newberry has also added useful observations here and there throughout the book.

The American edition has some serious misprints: even the names of the authors are spelled "Newbury and Gastrang" on the cover. Of the invasion of the north by Narmer the text says (p. 30), "Entering through the portal of the Northern Kingdom, he vanished as he went". The English edition has "vanquished". It is presumable that the authors are not responsible for these errors.

Antike Schlachtfelder in Griechenland. Bausteine zu einer antiken Kriegsgeschichte. Von Johannes Kromayer. Erster Band. Von Epaminondas bis zum Eingreifen der Römer. Mit sechs lithographischen Karten und vier Tafeln in Lichtdruck. (Berlin: Weidmann. 1903. Pp. x, 352.)

This book is the product of an expedition to Greece which was undertaken at the joint expense of the University of Strasburg and the Royal Academy of Sciences at Berlin. At the head of it was Professor Kromayer, now of Czernowitz, and with him were associated as expert advisers Captain Göppel and Colonel Janke of the General Staff of the German Army. The undertaking, which had for its purpose the location and delineation of battle-fields in Greece, was aided and encouraged by the governments, officials, and scholars of several nations. The book thus produced stands at present in the center of a very animated controversy. It arose in the following way. Professor Hans Delbrück had published the first volume of his History of the Art of War—that dealing with antiquity—and was on the point of issuing the second when the expedition returned. Professor Kromayer at once gave a lecture (Archäologischer Anzeiger, 1900, pp. 204-211) on his

investigation of the battle-field of Sellasia (221 B. C.), and developed a view divergent in its respect for Polybius and in its general plan from that which Delbrück held. He had earlier incurred the displeasure of the distinguished Berlin professor by a noteworthy article in Hermes (XXXV, pp. 217-253), entitled "Vergleichende Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen und römischen Heerwesens." Accordingly, Delbrück devoted two introductory sections of his second volume to a rather imperious settlement with his youthful critic. The Antike Schlachtfelder then appeared. Kromayer did not throw oil on the troubled waters. In controversy he proved to be a past-master. His style was cold and irritating like that of Matthew Arnold, and in addition to a lively imagination and a strong sense of humor he displayed a rare faculty for making difficult demonstrations seem perfectly obvious. book in fact was so exasperatingly plausible that it captivated the laity generally, and elicited the hearty commendation of no less than Wilamowitz. This provoked Delbrück to such a degree that in his own journal, the Preussische Jahrbücher (CXVI, 1904, pp. 209-240), under the caption "Theologische Philologie" he made a most amusing and vigorous onslaught upon this advocate of Kromayer. In it he refused to admit the right of any but a devotee of Clausewitz to a judgment in military matters, and-Publizistennatur im besten Sinne des Wortes, as Kromayer maliciously remarked—raised an alarmist's cry against scientific dogmatism and in particular against that phase of it for which, he said, Wilamowitz was notorious, and which, he claimed, took the form of a divine revelation.

Delbrück was patronizing toward Kromayer. Kromayer responded by assuming that the subject of his book, to which Delbrück, and after him perhaps most notably E. Lammert ("Die neuesten Forschungen auf antiken Schlachtfeldern in Griechenland", Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, XIII, 1904, pp. 112-135, 195-213, 252-280), had given much thought, was still in its infancy; that maps of the battlefields in Greece were the first prerequisites for a reconstruction of the ancient contests; and that all general conclusions on the art of war in antiquity were premature until reliable plans of the scene of action were in existence. It cannot, we think, be denied that Kromaver depreciated the topographical investigations of his predecessors, and that he felt unduly elated over the novelty and success of his own results. He gives us, indeed, six excellent maps, but all except one are compiled from earlier existing charts, and the one entirely new is the work of Captain Göppel. These maps certainly define within narrow limits the area in which the four battles considered: Mantinea, 362 B. C.; Chæronea, 338 B. C.; Sellasia, 221 B. C.; and Mantinea, 207 B. C., were fought, and must serve, with some slight additions or modifications, as the basis for all future interpretations of the literary accounts. but it is by no means likely that Kromayer has determined with finality the exact location of each engagement. Indeed, it has already been demonstrated by Georgios Sotiriades (Mitteilungen des kaiserlich deutschen archäologischen Instituts zu Athen, XXVIII, 1903, pp. 301-330), through a closer study of the battle-field of Chæronea, that this lay farther to the east in "the dancing-ground of Ares" than Kromayer made out. And while the writings of Lammert and of Delbrück's pupil, Gustav Roloff (Probleme aus der griechischen Kriegsgeschichte, Historische Studien, Heft III, Berlin, E. Ebering, 1903, pp. 141), have, it seems to us, failed in their object to discredit Kromayer's work generally, and have not proved his incapacity for all such investigations, they do make it clear that many questions have still to be settled before we can use the terrain as evidence for the tactics followed at Mantinea and Sellasia.

We rate highly the positive results of Kromayer's work—less highly, perhaps, than the author himself, or than those whose judgments were expressed before Lammert and the school of Delbrück fell afoul of the book. The chief value of the work, however, seems to us to lie in the charm with which the subject is invested. Kromayer has really remarkable talent in exposition. We are sure that, right or wrong, his treatment of the ancient battle-fields will do more to stimulate interest in the military history of antiquity, and thereby promote knowledge of it, than any other work that has recently appeared, Delbrück's Geschichte der Kriegskunst, in spite of its rare qualities, not excepted.

W. S. FERGUSON.

Griechische Geschichte. Von Julius Beloch. III. Die griechische Weltherrschaft. Erste und zweite Abteilungen. (Strasburg: Karl J. Trübner. 1904. Pp. xiv, 759; xvi, 576.)

Or these two volumes, the first contains an account of Greek thought and action from Alexander's crowning victory at Arbela to the time when Rome's advent in the east limited the freedom of Greek initiative (220 B. C.); the second carries the reader into the author's workshop, and shows him how the stones were prepared from which the edifice was erected. The genius of Beloch is well known. Persistency and skill in breaking through the mass of ancient combination and modern construction which hides the sources of our knowledge, rejection of the traditional as uniformly doubtful, a keen sense for the factors in history which admit of scientific measurement, success in linking the past to the present by judgments founded upon a well-considered, if somewhat individualistic standard of values, complete domination of the material, a straightforward, vigorous style-these are the qualities and methods which have led scholars to await with hope, interest, and anxiety Beloch's treatment of the period to which these volumes are devoted.

Volume III, part 1, may be divided into three unequal portions. The first (pp. 1-260) carries the narrative down to the irruption of the Gauls in 280 B. C., the last (pp. 556-759) continues it from that point to the